

assistance. One man stirred in answer, and was shot.

I could see no trace of emotion on the faces of the survivors, as they walked among the civilians trying to make identifications.

I was one of hundreds of American soldiers on the pilgrimage to Gardelegen. They react variously. Most are something from sobered to stunned. I saw a medic go virtually berserk, cursing and kicking the civilian burying crews as they hurried by. The soldiers in charge—combat troops all—are near the thin edge.

But the reaction of the civilians working around the barn and graveyard is something to ponder to infinity. Young and old, strong and infirm, they are all working at an hysterical feverish pace to end the nightmare. In teams of four they deposit the bodies, each with a clean, white shroud, and rush back for another. They are forced to run, and to handle the bodies with their bare hands. They are hazed every moment and worked almost until they drop.

I saw a boy of about 14, crying his heart out. Fear, horror, shame, hysteria, exhaustion, all flew like a flag on his face. The older men exhibit the same emotions, all canceled out to an expression of anguished nothingness. Some break. One tried to run and was shot in the leg. The others worked a little harder. One litter squad came by me with the man at the feet doing the work of two. His companion was lagging, exhausted. With part of its support gone, the body began to slip off onto the ground. The poor man was in a dilemma, trying to keep up the run, recover the body, and make his partner catch up, all at the same time. I doubt that he, or any of the others, will ever forget this day.

I understand that the SS officer and his 30 men who carried out this little affair were apprehended recently. They tried to pass themselves off as Wehrmacht troops, but were recognized.

Love,

Bob.

(Lt. Robert R. Batt, headquarters,
216 Field Artillery Battalion.)

Shall Alien Minds Determine America's Future?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the State and Treasury Departments are flooding the country with propaganda designed to influence Members of Congress on pending legislation. The number of letters being received by Members of Congress from members of women's organizations, ministers, and even high-school students clearly indicates the effectiveness of this campaign.

If Government agencies are permitted to continue their propaganda activities, Mr. Speaker, our entire democratic process of intelligent consideration of legislation and the independence of Congress will be destroyed.

The people of America must be informed as to what is going on. I therefore extend my remarks and include portions of a letter published by the National

Economic Council, Inc., which came across my desk this week:

SHALL ALIEN MINDS DETERMINE AMERICA'S FUTURE?

Never in our history has it been more important for Americans to think clearly. The question of whether the United States will continue toward national socialism will probably be settled in the next 4 years—possibly in the next 24 months.

The San Francisco Conference in which vitally important decisions can be made is just beginning.

Pending before Congress are such proposals as Bretton Woods, Dumbarton Oaks, and the several other agreements or treaties negotiated the past year or two by Mr. Roosevelt's administration. Adoption of them without important modification would so enmesh us in the affairs of other nations, every one of them less devoted to genuine freedom than ourselves, that nothing short of an upheaval would ever extricate us. And domestically there is the question whether we are going to retain all existing New Deal measures—and perhaps add others; or to reject the newer proposals "Cradle-to-grave security," "60,000,000 jobs—or else," etc., and modify or eliminate some of the more drastic laws we now have.

It is hard to base a prediction for the future on past history, because a new factor has entered in. The art of modern propaganda has been developed. It has been clever, thorough, ruthless, and often untruthful. Relatively few Americans understand either its source or its extent and potency.

Every day we meet business and professional men of standing in their fields, as well as men and women highly regarded for their generous attitude toward their fellow men, who simply do not know what it is all about. They do not realize that many of the very views they express have been formulated by cunning men and women; and that through New Deal control of radio and New Deal influence among most of the country's writers, these ideas have been implanted in their minds so cleverly that they never doubt they are their own. They fail to note that the minds of the Germans were molded by Hitler in precisely similar ways.

They do not know that, with rare exceptions, many of the country's best writers simply cannot get magazine articles published if they express views contrary to the New Deal. They do not know that, while in 1944 Martin Dies and his friends could not find a publisher courageous enough to print his book telling the truth about the New Deal and its communistic supporters, the counters of our book shops have groaned under the weight of books extolling the New Deal, Russian communism, and pretty much everything Russia has ever done. For fear of Washington retribution, the American people have been denied, in true totalitarian style, the right to know both sides.

One book, *Under Cover*, written by an Armenian immigrant with a communistic background, and which scurrilously and falsely attacked scores of patriotic Americans for the sole reason they opposed the New Deal and Communist Russia, sold more than 600,000 copies. We listened several times to grave conversations in well-known New York clubs between supposedly intelligent men who had been completely fooled by this book, which was, of course, a mere document in the 1944 political campaign.

This propaganda is alien in origin and conception. It stems directly from eastern and central Europe. It is designed to undermine and destroy America; and it is having that effect.

It follows the best techniques of Hitler and Mussolini. John T. Flynn, in his book, *As We Go Marching*, has traced the step-by-

step development of fascism in Italy and nazism in Germany. In both cases the cornerstone of those edifices was deficit financing. And in tracing the growth of our own totalitarian government in Washington he has shown how closely it has paralleled these two European dictatorships. Austrian-born Friedrich Hayek, in his *The Road to Serfdom*, has written in the same vein.

The fact that American Communists and their fellow travelers have been supporters of our American fascism need surprise no one. Their hope has been that, following the analogy in Italy and Germany, the next step after American fascism will be American communism.

In passing, it is worth noting that alien-minded persons, whether in public office or outside, are among the leading molders of public opinion in the United States today. Some of them, for reasons best known to themselves, have changed their names. Some are Communists or fellow travelers, and nearly all are more or less tolerant of communism. Many are artists in the technique of smear. Few, if any, give more than lip service to traditional American principles. Their writings are welcomed by publishers and reviewers; they have the freedom of the radio, while many advocates of the American system are refused radio time. * * *

Several aliens, like Sir Bernard Pares, have taken up temporary residence here, apparently for the purpose of indoctrinating our people. John Maynard Keynes is the actual author of our 12-year policy of deficit financing and the principal inspiration of the Bretton Woods agreement. * * *

We question at this time neither the ability nor sincerity of any of these persons. But they are not believers in the American way of life. They and others like-minded, dominate our public opinion. The independent American republic will be destroyed if their domination continues.

Two characteristic current propaganda activities deserve mention. The International Latex Corporation, Abraham N. Spanel, president, has for many months been publishing in many American newspapers quarter-page advertisements urging New Deal policies, national and international. Thus, the New York Herald Tribune of April 21 contained such an advertisement endorsing Bretton Woods. Over the company's name at the end of each advertisement is the legend, "Presented as a public service." The Blue Network carries a news program five nights a week under the sponsorship of the Electronic Corporation, of which Russian-born Samuel Novick is president. The broadcaster is William Gailmor, who changed his name from William Margolies, under which he pleaded guilty to grand larceny and is now out on parole. He has a communistic record.

Considerable inquiry reveals that the business of both the International Latex Corporation and the Electronic Corporation is so modest as to suggest their chief activity may be the propaganda they are carrying on, if, indeed, they were not organized for this purpose.

America has two great needs today.

The first is to return to the American way of life. If we do not return to the American way of life, American liberty will have been lost. "What can it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" What can it profit America if it set up a world organization in which its identity and independence are lost or even impaired, with the further result that in order to do our part in such an organization we must continue for the indefinite future to be a regimented people?

Of course, the current propaganda has it that America cannot return to the American way of life. We are told that, having

achieved total employment in wartime (under coercion, of course) we can likewise achieve it in peacetime. We can. But only if the state tells every man where to work, for how long, and for how much; how he may spend his money, and where; only if we Americans permit the state to plan and regulate our lives. We can do this, but only if we continue deficit financing. But in doing it, we will have turned our back on all American experience. We will have deserted the principles that made America great and rendered her able to subsidize her allies and thus win the war. We will have rejected America and will have embraced the very Fascism we say we hate.

Those of our boys overseas who come home will find the America they were told they were fighting for has irretrievably gone.

It is of more importance to the 130,000,000 American people that we return to the liberty we have always known—than it is even to achieve a world organization.

America's second need is to try to build a kind of world organization that will do something to prevent war in the future. But one grave danger of such a world organization is that we shall place too much reliance on it; and another is that, if controlled by Roosevelts, Stalins, or Churchills, it will tend to become a totalitarian superstate, just as the United States has tended the past 12 years to centralize all power in Washington.

We believe the greatest factor for peace is the existence of a strong, independent, law-abiding nation, unwilling to make war against any of its neighbors, and prepared to defend itself against all comers. The example of one such nation (and the United States during much of its history has been such a nation) will be far more potent than treaties or agreements, no matter how high-sounding their phrases. Just one such powerful nation possessed of the complete will for peace can go far in maintaining the peace of the entire world. If the United States, Britain, and Russia all determine upon peace, then there will be peace, unless other nations believe that before reaching that determination one or more of them have first despoiled other countries, which Russia has actually done.

So, it is an open question whether the existence of an elaborate world organization, constantly tempted to mess into all sorts of matters, will not tend to increase rather than decrease the chance of war. We know this thought flies in the face of the propaganda barrage we live under today. But our problem is not to accept highly propagandized ideas, but to think.

Several fallacies of the propagandists are widely and unthinkingly accepted. One of these is the old saw that after the last war the United States "turned her back on Europe"—that if the United States had entered the League of Nations there would have been no more war. But we did not turn our back on Europe. It was the willfulness of President Wilson that prevented our entering the League of Nations. Even Sir Edward Grey, British Foreign Minister, in 1919 expressed the opinion that the reservations asked by the United States Senate were reasonable and should have been approved. No nation in the world did more to preserve the peace of Europe after 1919 than the United States. We scrapped nearly a million tons of our war vessels—though other nations scrapped few, if any; we loaned Europe \$6,000,000,000 for rebuilding—little of which was ever repaid; we took part in numerous international conferences; we led in pushing the Kellogg-Briand pacts to outlaw war.

What brought on this war was not our staying out of the League of Nations, but rather the fact that Britain and France refused to lift a finger to stop Hitler when he made his first aggression by moving into the Rhineland in 1936. Though they were, of all parties to the Versailles Treaty, the most

vitaly concerned, yet, owing to Red pacifist propaganda, they did not have the will to enforce their own treaty.

Another fallacy, constantly reiterated, is that economic inequalities in different parts of the world make for war. There is little in history to back this. If this argument had serious weight, why did not other nations far more powerful militarily than the United States make war on us when we were overtaking and passing them in the standard of living? Is it not possible the idea has its source in the have-not nations who have long had envious eyes on the United States and wish to force us to divide our living with them?

Then there is the one-world argument—the theory that in the future it will be impossible to maintain peace unless all nations are welded together in one organization. The speed of communication, especially by airplane, is assigned as the reason for this. But on analysis this argument also falls down. There has been peace between the United States and Canada for a hundred and thirty years; and the reason is that there has been a will to peace. At least five countries in Europe—Spain, Switzerland, Sweden, Turkey (till very recently), and Ireland—have kept out of even this present war; and, similarly, the reason has been the will to keep out.

Lastly, there is the fallacy that we cannot have prosperity in the United States unless all other countries have comparable prosperity. No good reason is given why this should be so, and all human experience indicates it is not so. As a matter of fact, the history of the past hundred years indicates the precise opposite, so far as the United States is concerned, namely, that the rest of the world can become more prosperous if the United States is prosperous. For the United States, by reason of achieving general liberty for its people, released energies of the body, mind, and spirit which have placed us far in the lead of all nations in the manner of our life and living. Practically all the world has sought to imitate us, but most of them have failed because they did not understand that our cornerstone was individual liberty. Testimony before Congress recently showed that we are far ahead of the Russians in the productive power of the individual, and that even in Britain it takes—on the average—the work of two and three-tenths men to produce what one man produces in the United States.

The proper course for the United States is to keep the sovereignty and independence of her Nation and her people. For only so can she continue in the future to be the example that has inspired the whole world in the past. And we can do no better than set an example.

After the war all Europe and Asia will be poverty stricken. American wealth, imagination, and creative ability—provided they are preserved—will alone be able to help those countries. For us to enter into agreements with other nations that will give them the first call on our wealth and a large control over our affairs would, for us Americans, be the height of folly. To adopt the Bretton Woods agreement, for instance, by which, in effect, other countries may vote taxes on the American people by assessments against our resources, would suggest that both our love of independence and our sanity had departed. We would have lied to our fighting men to whom we have promised a better future.

We know we can help the people of other countries, if only we are free to help them. But to get down to their level, and to surrender the freedom of our people, would be practically to insure that our ability to help them in the future would be cramped if not destroyed. We would have sold ourselves and our descendants into bondage to them.

Party Congress Is Held on Eve of Transition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the world is about to witness a remarkable event—a political party which possesses practically complete power voluntarily setting out to surrender that preferred position, in accordance with pledges made many years ago.

The Chinese Kuomintang Party was established by Dr. Sun Yat-sen. It succeeded in overthrowing the Manchu Empire and, under Chiang Kai-shek's leadership, ended the period of feudal war lords, secured for China tariff autonomy, abolition of the foreign concessions and extraterritoriality, and made almost unbelievable progress between 1932 and 1937 in modernizing China in such fields as education, transportation, industry, public health, and first steps in political democracy. This was the period of political tutelage under the Kuomintang as Dr. Sun had advocated. The period was scheduled to end with the convention called to meet in Nanking on November 12, 1937, to adopt a constitution establishing a true republic. On July 7, 1937, 4 months ahead, Japan struck without warning, and when November 12 came, Japan's armies were threatening Nanking itself, capturing it in December.

Obviously when a nation's very existence hangs by a thread, as China's has all these war years, it is not feasible to effect a drastic change in the whole character of its government. So Chiang postponed the constitutional convention, but announced repeatedly that it would be called within a year after the end of the war—just as Churchill postponed England's election scheduled for almost 5 years ago and has not yet announced when it will be held.

In China's case, however, Chiang agreed to hold the constitutional convention even before the war is over, setting the date for November 12, 1945. The Kuomintang Party is now meeting in Chungking to plan for that convention. It is one more evidence of the steadfast determination of Chiang Kai-shek and most of the Kuomintang leaders to establish a real democracy in China at the earliest practicable moment. It will be a most difficult task but all true friends of China and of America wish them well, because a strong friendly democratic China is our best assurance of security in the Pacific.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include a news story from an American paper, the Shanghai Evening Post and Mercury, of May 4, 1945:

PARTY CONGRESS IS HELD ON EVE OF TRANSITION
(By Charles S. Miner)

CHUNGKING.—China's biggest step toward democracy is expected when the Kuomintang convenes Saturday for the first time in 10 years.